

**Payment of A.I.C.T.E. Scales of pay to the Staff of School of Arts,
Davangere**

485. **SRI K. P. NADAGOUDA** (Mudhol).—

Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it is a fact that the number of staff of the School of Arts, Davangere are not paid according to the A.I.C.T.E. Scales of pay and that consequently the grants given by the Government of India to the State Government has lapsed since 1964 ;

(b) if so, the reasons for the same ?

SRI K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA (Minister for Education).—

(a) They are not eligible to A.I.C.T.E. scales of pay and hence the question does not arise.

(b) The Staff of the School of Arts and Crafts, Davangre consists of the following category :—

- (i) Local candidates.
- (ii) Deputed from other Departments.
- (iii) On contract basis.

Hence they are not eligible to the A.I.C.T.E. pay scales as per rules. As the Cadre and Recruitment Rules pertaining to this School have not yet been issued, appointments on permanent basis have not been made so far.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Notice of a motion about the conduct of the Speaker

SRI M. NAGAPPA (Raichur)—Sir, before the next item is taken up, I have something to say. I had given Notice of a Motion against the conduct of the Speaker on 24th September 1970, and you had also assured us on the floor of this House that it will be considered today.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am really surprised. I had a very long discussion on the subject and the hon. Member had told me that he would again come to me with some other authority.

SRI M. NAGAPPA.—I had not said that I am coming, but you wanted that I should come. I had requested you that I must be heard first.

MR. SPEAKER.—The other day I had told the hon. Member that I would hear him in my chambers and not here. Unless the motion is admitted, it cannot come up before the House. I shall give my Ruling on Monday.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, how can you do that unless you hear me and unless the House knows it?

2-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It cannot come here before it is admitted.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I do not say whether it is given consent or not. It is a motion, I have got to say on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Any motion must be admitted before it comes up here.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—The Chair may give an opportunity to the members to explain the reasons for it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I had asked the hon. Member to come to my chambers with authorities. Even now I request him to do so. When a Member raises a motion, whether he belongs to a minority group or a majority group, it is all the same to the Chair. I have already requested him to come to my chambers.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Before you give your considered ruling I must be heard.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am on a point of order. You were pleased to say that we may be heard in your Chambers. I have seen the rules. I do not see anywhere in the rules that the Speaker can hear a Member in his chambers. I will be obliged if you can enlighten us under which provision you can demand a Member to see you in your chambers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa has raised a point under which rule I can demand a Member to see me in my chambers. I may tell you that the Speaker has got powers to admit a notice, a motion or a question. Then the question arises whether the Speaker can hear the members on the floor of the House or in his chambers. But I have developed a convention that before disposing of anything I should hear the Members in my chambers. Unless the notice is admitted, it does not become the property of the House and no Member can speak on it. Before my admission of the notice, effort has been made by the hon. Members rightly or wrongly to publicise things. It is not proper to publish them unless they are admitted.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Before giving consent you have heard Members on so many instances. I can quote a number of such instances and you have created precedents on the floor of the House. I can quote a number of rulings given by the Speakers of other States.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That may be on different matters on different occasions. Now I have adopted this practice and this is going on since a long time. This may be taken as a final ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರನ್ನು ಶನಿವಾರ ಹಿಮ್ಮೆರೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು, ಅವರನ್ನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ)

ಹಿರುರ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕು. ಛೇಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿರುರ ಮಾಡಲು ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿರುವಂತೆ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲೇ ಬೇಕು. ತಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದೆಯೆಂದು ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹಚ್ಚಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇರುವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆರೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have promised Sri Nagappa to hear him. I have already heard him once or twice. I did not say that I would hear him in the House. I had given him an invitation to come to my chambers. If he wants me to hear him even now, I will hear him again in my chambers. The practice of hearing a Member in the House before a notice or a motion is admitted, becomes unhealthy. Even if a Member is permitted to speak before it is admitted, the matter will have to be discussed for a great length of time and results in unnecessary consumption of time. Therefore, what I have stated in this connection stands.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Some may feel shy to discuss with you certain matters in your chambers. ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್‌ನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಛೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರಲು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದಿರಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಂದು ಎಲೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯಿದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ರಿಫ್ಲೆಕ್ಸ್‌ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ತಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ನು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಮೂಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬಾರದು. ಅದಾದರಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಘನತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತಮಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon. Member is asking me a very embarrassing question. I may tell him that I have developed by experience and training an impersonal attitude even if it pertains to me. Now the Members want me to create a wrong precedent when a notice of a motion is given I have developed a practice of hearing the Members in my chambers.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Before a notice was admitted, you heard yesterday some of the elderly persons. Can I presume that you heard them because the elderly persons have signed that notice? You are not allowing Sri Nagappa because he is not an elderly person.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To me, all hon. Members are equal. It does not make any difference to me whether one is an elder member of the House or not. I am bound to treat every hon. Member as equal and in an impartial manner. In my humble way I have been trying to do it. Of course, I might have committed mistakes here and there. I do not say that I am infallible. I do not want yesterday's matter to be a precedent. I accept and appreciate very much the suggestion thrown yesterday by an elderly member of this House. I think that is the correct thing and I shall follow that procedure hereafter.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—You created a wrong precedent yesterday. Today you are saying you do not want to create a wrong precedent.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—You take recourse to your chambers when it is not convenient for you to hear a certain matter in the House. You are taking shelter under the plea of hearing in your chambers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want to suppress anything after hearing the Members in my chambers. It is a very unhealthy practice to hear all the Members giving notices in the House. The House is not meant for that. A session of the House is meant for debate and things like admission of questions, motions, etc., have to be done in the chambers. If all this business also were to be transacted here, then probably there would be no time left for debate and discussions in the House. The Chamber is also as good a part of the House as the House itself. It is not my private chamber or my private house, but it is a chamber to which every hon. Member has access and is entitled to have access.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—We are highly allergic to your chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Call Attention notice may be taken up. Sri S. S. Arakeri to call the attention of the Chief Minister.

Sri ABDUL KHUDDUS ANWAR (Bhadravati).—Sir, I had sent my call attention notice long back and I have observed all the formalities of meeting the Secretary and the Speaker in his chamber. I do not know why it is not taken up. There is sabotage going on in the Mysore Iron and Steel Works and about Rs. 4 lakhs worth of materials have been removed, with the result that the electric furnace cannot work now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under rule 63 only one calling attention matter can come up on a day. All these calling attention notices are entered in a register and according to that order, they will come up before the House. The hon. Member will have to take his chance.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, has the hon. Member given previous notice for raising this matter here?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Then why are you answering him?

Sri AZIZ SAIT (Narasimharaja).—Sir, in parliamentary democracy when there is a certain matter raised against the Speaker like no-confidence motion or motion of regret, the Speaker voluntarily admits such a motion and vacates his Chair and allows the motion to be discussed threadbare. When the hon. Member Sri Nagappa has sent a motion of regret against the Speaker, it is not correct on your part to try to shelve it and ask the Member to come to your chamber. As one of the hon. Members said, there is a certain amount of allergy on the part of certain hon. Members to come to your chamber; similarly you have also allergy to certain hon. Members and you try to suppress them. It is very painful. You may say that you have supreme authority and you can do anything you want. This is very unreasonable. If you are sincere, what you should do is to admit the motion and ask the Deputy Speaker to preside and allow the motion to be discussed in the House and you must take rest in your chamber as other Presiding Officers are doing in other

(SRI AZIZ SAIT)

Legislatures. You can be sure that the motion will not be passed, because you have got the backing of the Members on the other side who are behind you always whether you are right or wrong. So my submission to you is that you should allow us to discuss this motion here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The observations made by the hon. Member Sri Aziz Sait are most irrelevant, not justifiable and made without any basis because there is no motion before the House.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—There is a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It becomes a motion for discussion only after its admission. All the observations made by the hon. Member are without foundation. The allegation that the majority is there to support me and minority is there to oppose me, is irrelevant. I do not make any distinction between majority and minority. The Speaker is independent of majority or minority. The Speaker holds office during the pleasure of the House. An attempt is made by this motion to malign the Speaker. It is a most unparliamentary and undemocratic attempt to say that the moment the notice is given, it will have to be discussed in the House. If this is the case then tomorrow other members will give other notices and insist on those matters to be discussed. In such a case no business can be transacted in the House. This is not permitted under the Constitution and I shall not permit it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು).—ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಏನೋ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಏನೋ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಏನೋ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ತಾವು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ತಾವು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ, ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ನಡುವೆ ಈ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇತ್ತು, ನಮಗೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇರುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾರ್ಕುರು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ತಾವು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ತಾವು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರಾಕರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ನಮಗೆ ಇದೆ, ಈಗ ನಿಮ್ಮಿಬ್ಬರ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ಖಾಸಗಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವಲ್ಲ, ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸರಿಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಆವಾದವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ವಸುಲೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We have seen that it leads us nowhere. We say something and you say some other thing. We never agree; we never come to some understanding. I understand that my friend Sri Nanje Gowda has given notice of a No-Confidence Motion against you. I do not know whether it is true or not. All these problems will be solved if you give an early date for the discussion. I know that under the Rules at least 14 days' time is necessary. This is not going to lead us anywhere, as I have already said, because every time you take the chair—I have the greatest respect to you personally—all these troubles will start. Therefore, my respectful submission is that

it is better you give an opportunity to the members to say whatever they have got to say with regard to the motion of No-Confidence notice which, I understand, has already been given signed by 42 members. I would request you to get it examined.

So far as the motion of Sri Nagappa is concerned, I have seen it. I think at one stage you were pleased to say—if I am wrong you may correct me—that such a motion is tenable under the Rules. Therefore, it is up to you to give us an opportunity to discuss it.

Then, we have to discuss the very important subject about Public Service Commission, and that is a subject in which we are very much interested. For the first time during the term of the Fourth Assembly the report of the Public Service Commission is coming up for discussion. I personally feel that even if we discuss like this for the whole day you and we will not agree. Therefore, it is better we stop at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I have already stated, unless a notice is admitted it cannot be published and no publication of this notice or any other notice, should be made unless it is admitted by the Speaker. This is for the information of all the members and also the Prsses.

As regards the motions given notice of by Members, I assure the House that the provisions of the Constitution and Rules will be meticulously followed both in letter and spirit. Hon. Members will probably remember that this was done on the last occasion. No hon. Member need be under the impression that I am afraid of these things. The moment I feel that the members on this side or that side I have no confidence in me, I will not be here even for a single minute, even if I am pressed to remain here. That is the position. What I find is an effort is being made to malign a Presiding Officer. The notice has not come before me; probably it is being processed. I may say that even if there are certain defects in that motion, it would be permitted.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If you say that we are maligning you, I have to say that that it is a very uncharitable remark.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A senior member like the hon. Member should know that a notice cannot be discussed in the House without the Chair admitting it. I do not want to attribute any motive to the hon. Member or any other hon. Member but that is the effect.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—You may be under the impression that since you command the confidence of the right section of the House, such things may be done. But I may tell you that if you have to successfully function here, and if this side of the House does not co-operate with you, your life will become miserable.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the co-operation of every hon. Member not only on this side but also of the other side. I may tell the hon. Members that I am also very eager to give an opportunity to the members to discuss this very important matter.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—I rise on a point of order Sir. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಡೇಟ್ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯ ಪರಿಗಣನೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಡೇಟ್ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸೆಪರೇಟ್ ಸೆಷನ್‌ನ್ನು

(SRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA)

ಕರೆದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. 11 ದಿವಸ ಮುಂಚೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ಈ ಸೆಷನ್ ಸೋಮವಾರ ಮುಗಿಯುವುದರಿಂದ ಎರಡೇ ದಿವಸ ಚೈಂ ಇರುವುದು. ಮುಂದಿನ ಬಜೆಟ್ ಸೆಷನ್‌ವರೆಗೂ ಕಾಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಚೈಂ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಸಮನ್ಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್‌ಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸೆಷನ್‌ನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಿರಿ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್‌ಗೆ ಸಮನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no force in the point of order.

3-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಸೆಷನ್ ಕರೆಯುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The sense of the House will have to be taken. When the House should be called vests in the authorities laid down under the Constitution, So, I cannot reply to this question now.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Sir, I am referring to the point which Mr. Nagappa has already made. I am not going against the ruling. I would submit one point: Rule 148 says:

“148: In order that a motion may be admissible it shall satisfy the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) it shall raise substantially one definit issue;
- (ii) it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, imputations or defamatory statements;
- (iii) it shall not refer to the conduct or character of persons except in their public capacity;
- (iv) it shall be restricted to a matter of recent occurrence;
- (v) it shall not raise a question of privilege;
- (vi) it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session;
- (vii) it shall not anticipate discussion of a matter which is likely to be discussed in the same session;
- (viii) it shall not relate to any matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India.

My point is this: you have got to be satisfied whether the Motion of Nagappa is admissible. You will have to examine and then give the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon. Member is trying to argue a hypothetical, case. There is no point of order.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I am only requesting you to give an opportunity to Mr. Nagappa to explain himself, so that you may make up your mind one way or the other. It is not proper to ask Mr. Nagappa to come to your Chamber to discuss these points.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All these arguments have no application. There is no force in the argument. It is neither a point of law, nor a point of order. ●

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—What are the contents of the notice, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The contents of the notice cannot be disclosed unless it is admitted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆ. 148ನೇ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ನಾನು ಅದೇ ರೂಲನ್ನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗತಾನೇ ತಾವು ಮೆರೈನ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಪಪ್ರಚಾರವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಇದೆ. ಆಗ ಮೋಷನ್ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊದಲು ತಾವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು, ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಮೆರೈನ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಮಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸೌಜನ್ಯವಿದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನನಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದುಸಾರಿ, ಎರಡು ಸಾರಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಚೇಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅನ್ನಿಸಿತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನಗೂ ಕೆಲವು ಅಥಾರಿಟೀಸ್ ಇವೆ. ಅವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಥಾರಿಟಿ ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೂ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ನನ್ನ ಚೇಂಬರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು 146ನೇ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವುದು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ತಾರೀಖು 26-9-70ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the hon. Member referring to the same matter or to any other ? If it is the same matter, I do not permit him to read it.

(Mr. Nagappa persisted in reading)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member is creating disorder in the House and obstructing the proceeding of the House. I direct the hon. Member to withdraw from the House.

(Sri M. Nagappa withdrew)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am thankful to the hon. Members that there is no intention on their part to malign the Chair. I accept their *bona fides*. The fact is, very often the rules are by passed and what is forbidden to be discussed, is sought to be discussed and confusion is created. That would not be in order. Whatever has to be done, will be done strictly in accordance with the rules, not only in letter but in spirit also.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಡ್ಕೆಮಾನ್ಸಿಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಕೆಲವರು ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿ ತಮಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತಾವು ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದರೆ, ತಮಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಅದು ಬಂದಕೂಡಲೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾರ್ಯಾರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆವೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಬಾರದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಈಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವಿವರ ಆದರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಥವಾ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು ಅದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ)

ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೀಗೆ ಇದೆ, ಇದು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರೋರೋಗ್ ಆದರೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ವೋಟೇಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು. ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನೀವೂ ನಹ ನಿಮ್ಮ ರಕ್ತ ಮಾಂಸಖಂಡಗಳಲ್ಲ ಅಡಗಿತಕ್ಕ ದುಃಖ, ಸುಖ, ಮೋಹ ಇವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸವನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾಟಂಗ್ ಪ್ರೋರೋಗ್ ಆದರೂ ಇದು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಇಂತಹ ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ತಾವು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಭಾರಿ ಸೌಜನ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮೆರೆಗು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಒರಟಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಲೈಬ್ರೆರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಕೋಪದಲ್ಲ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಹುಕುಂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ರಿವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಸಭೆಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಬರುವಂತೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಏನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಬಾರದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not done it in any anger. It was done just to enable the House to transact its work smoothly and quietly. I cannot revise that order now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕಣ್ಣಾರೆ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಫೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಇದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನಮಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಎಂತಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಎಮಿನೆಂಟ್ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ನನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತಾವೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that my order cannot be revised. Now Mr. Arakeri to call the attention of the Minister.

Calling Attention to a matter of urgent Public Importance re: retrenchment of local candidates

Sri S. S. ARAKERI (Balloli).—I call the attention of the Chief Minister to the retrenchment of local candidates.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—I call the attention of the Chief Minister to the retrenchment of local candidates.

† Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—With your permission I beg to make the following statement :

Last year, the Public Service Commission selected 5,497 candidates for appointment to several ministerial posts and posts of Stenographers and Typists. Consequent to this, certain number of local candidates who were to be replaced by candidates selected by Public Service Commission were retrenched and the subject was raised in this House at that time. During the course of my statement made in this House on 20th August 1969, I had indicated that if local candidates were continued